

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

ZOE HOLLIS, individually and on behalf of
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

R & R RESTAURANTS, INC dba SASSY’S,
an Oregon corporation; **STACY MAYHOOD**,
an individual; **IAN HANNIGAN**, an
individual; **FRANK FAILLACE**, an
individual; and **DOES 1 through 10**, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:21-cv-965-YY

ORDER

Michael H. Simon, District Judge.

United States Magistrate Judge Youlee Yim You issued Findings and Recommendation in this case on May 2, 2022. Judge You recommended that this Court grant in part Plaintiff’s motion for equitable tolling, and toll the statute of limitations from between October 18, 2021, and the date notice is issued to potential collective action members. No party has filed objections.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act (Act), the court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party objects to a magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations, “the court

shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If no party objects, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) (“There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report to which no objections are filed.”); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (holding that the court must review *de novo* magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”).

Although review is not required in the absence of objections, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No party having made objections, this Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Judge You’s Findings and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS Judge You’s Findings and Recommendation, ECF 36. The Court GRANTS IN PART Plaintiff’s motion for equitable tolling, ECF 23. The Court tolls the statute of limitations from October 18, 2021, through the date the notice is issued to potential collective action members.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 24th day of May, 2022.

/s/ Michael H. Simon
Michael H. Simon
United States District Judge